

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Charlottesville Division**

GREENBERRY'S FRANCHISING)
CORPORATION)

Plaintiff)

v.)

ALICE Y. PARK et al.,)

Defendants.)

Civil Action No. 3:10cv-00045-NKM

**ANSWER OF ANTHONY D. HAN
TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW Defendant, Anthony D. Han ("Han"), by counsel, and submits his answer to Plaintiff's Complaint.

1. Admitted.

a. Denied.

b. Denied.

c. Denied.

d. Denied.

e. Denied.

f. Denied.

g. Allegation is against Co-Defendant Alice Park, therefore,

Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

h. Denied.

i. Denied.

2. There is no averment number 2, therefore, no answer is needed.
3. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny averment number 3, therefore, denies the same.
4. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny averment number 4, therefore, denies the same.
5. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny averment number 5, therefore, denies the same.
6. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny averment number 6, therefore, denies the same.
7. Admitted.
8. Admitted.
9. Admitted.
10. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.
11. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Brian Park, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.
12. Allegations are against Co-Defendant GNT, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.
13. Admit that Han has been served with process in Virginia. All other allegations are denied.
14. Admit that Han Holding has been served with process in Virginia. All other allegations are denied.

15. Denied. All of the events as alleged occurred in the Alexandria Division of the Eastern District of Virginia.

16. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 16, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

17. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 17, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

18. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 18, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

a. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 18(a), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

b. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 18(b), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

c. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 18(c), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

d. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 18(d), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

19. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 19, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

20. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 20, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

21. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 21, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

22. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 22, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

23. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 23, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

24. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 24, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

25. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 25, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

26. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 26, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

27. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 27, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

28. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 28, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

29. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 29, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

30. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 30, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

31. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

a. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(a), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

b. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(b), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

c. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(c), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

d. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(d), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

e. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(e), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

f. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(f), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

g. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(g), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

h. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(h), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

i. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(i), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

j. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(j), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

k. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(k), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

l. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(l), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

m. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(m), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

n. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(n), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

o. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 31(o), therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

32. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 32, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

33. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 33, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

34. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 34, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

35. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 35, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

36. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 36, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

37. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 37, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

38. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 38, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

39. Denied.

40. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 40, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

a. Admitted to the extent that Co-Defendants Alice Park and Brian Park are no longer involved in the operation of the Leesburg Franchise, and denied to the remaining allegations in averment number 40(a).

b. Denied.

c. Denied.

d. Denied.

e. Denied.

f. Denied.

g. Denied.

h. Denied.

41. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 41, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

42. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 42, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

43. Defendant does not have sufficient information either to admit or deny the averment number 43, therefore, denies the same and demand strict proof thereof.

44. Denied.

45. Denied.

46. Denied.

COUNT I: BREACH OF CONTRACT (against Alice Park)

47. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 46.

48. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

49. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

a. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

b. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

c. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

d. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

e. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

f. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

g. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

h. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

i. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

j. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

k. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

l. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

m. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

n. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

50. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

a. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

b. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

c. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

d. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

e. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

f. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

g. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

51. Allegations are against Co-Defendant Alice Park only, therefore, Defendant Han does not have an answer to this averment.

COUNT II: TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT (Against Brian Park, GNT, Han and Han Holdings)

- 52. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 51.
- 53. Denied.
- 54. Denied.
- 55. Denied.
- 56. Denied.

COUNT III: TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH BUSINESS RELATIONS AND BUSINESS EXPECTANCY (against Brian Park, GNT, Han and Han Holdings)

- 57. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 56.
- 58. Denied.
- 59. Denied.
- 60. Denied.
- 61. Denied.

COUNT IV: STATUTORY AND COMMON LAW CIVIL CONSPIRACY (against All Defendants)

- 62. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 61.
- 63. Denied.
- 64. Denied.
- 65. Denied.

66. Denied.

67. Denied.

COUNT V: CONVERSION (against Alice Park, Brian Park, Han and Han

Enterprises)

68. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 67.

69. Denied.

70. Denied.

71. Denied.

72. Denied.

73. Denied.

COUNT VI: VIOLATION OF THE VIRGINIA UNIFORM TRADE SECRETS

ACT (against Brian Park, Han and Han Enterprises)

74. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 73.

75. Denied.

76. Denied.

77. Denied.

78. Denied.

COUNT VII: COMPUTER FRAUD AND COMPUTER TRESPASS UNDER THE

VIRGINIA COMPUTER CRIMES ACT (against Han and Han Holdings)

79. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 78.

80. Denied.

81. Denied.

82. Denied.

COUNT VIII: TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT (against Alice Park, Brian Park,

Han and Han Enterprises)

- 83. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 82.
- 84. Denied.
- 85. Denied.
- 86. Denied.
- 87. Denied.
- 88. Denied.
- 89. Denied.
- 90. Denied.

COUNT IX: FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN (against Alice Park, Brian

Park, Han and Han Enterprises)

- 91. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 90.
- 92. Denied.
- 93. Denied.
- 94. Denied.

COUNT X: COMMON LAW TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT AND UNFAIR

COMPETITION (against Alice Park, Brian Park, Han and Han Enterprises)

- 95. Defendant incorporates answers provided in paragraphs 1 through 94.
- 96. Denied.
- 97. Denied.
- 98. Denied.
- 99. Denied.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

ANTHONY D. HAN

BY COUNSEL

/s/ Peter W. Rim

Peter W. Rim, VSB 41837
Andrew E. Macfarlane, VSB 75144
Attorney for Defendant Anthony D. Han
Lohrmann & Rim, P.C.
7700 Little River Turnpike, Suite 506
Annandale, VA 22003
(703) 941-3700
(703) 941-3782 FAX
e-mail: prim@lohrmannandrim.com
amacfarl@lohrmannandrim.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 29, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the clerk of the court using the CM/ECF system, which will send electronic notification of such filing to such individuals listed below:

Patrick C. Asplin
Richard Armstrong
Nancy R. Schlichting
Lenhart Obenshain, P.C.
100 10th Street, N.E., Suite 300
Charlottesville, VA 22902
pca@lolawfirm.com
rca@lolawfirm.com
nrs@lolawfirm.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

Meghan Cloud
McGuire Woods, LLP
Court Square Building
310 4th Street, N.E., Suite 300
Charlottesville, VA 22902-1288
mcloud@mcguirewoods.com

Mark P. Friedlander, Jr.
Friedlander, Friedlander & Earman, P.C.
1364 Beverly Road, Suite 201
McLean, VA 22101
mpfriedlander@verizon.net
*Attorneys for Defendants GNT Enterprise, Inc., Alice
Park and Brian T. Park*

/s/ Peter W. Rim
Lohrmann & Rim, P.C.
7700 Little River Turnpike, Suite 506
Annandale, VA 22003
(703) 941-3700
(703) 941-3782 FAX
e-mail: prim@lohrmannandrim.com
amacfarl@lohrmannandrim.com